

Sinclair
Broadcasting's
decision to force
their stations to
air an anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election
is a clear example
of the dangers of
media consolidation.
Further, this is in
direct violation of
the electioneering
laws that provide
full and fair access
to the media for
both parties. If
Sinclair chose to
also air Fahrenheit
9/11 as well, they
would STILL be in
violation of the
electioneering and
equal time clauses
of the law.

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, and is
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest. But when
large companies
control the
airwaves, we get
more of the
corporate head's
personal opinion
being touted as
news, We are denied
the natural discourse
of the electoral
process in the guise
of a partisan and
false attack
designed to usurp
the will of the
people. Instead of
something produced
at "News Central"
far away, it's more
important that we
see real people from
our own communities
and more substantive
news about issues
that matter.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. They
show why the license
renewal process
needs to involve
more than a returned
postcard. In fact,
Sinclair's act is
the desperate act of
a media conglomerate
attempting to seize
through tyranny the
access to public
opinion and
influence a vitally
important election
beyond the normal
scope of the media
role in the public
debate. Sinclair has
sold out democracy
in favor of personal
party opinion and
party-funded
vitriol. Thank you.